

ELDER, HARKNESS & BINGHAM,
Proprietors.

Yearly subscribers \$5.00, IN ADVANCE, or delivered by the carrier at 12 1/2 cents per week, payable monthly. Single copies five cents.
City subscribers will be held responsible for papers left at their houses after they have removed, or when they wish them discontinued, unless notice is given at the office of publication.
By paper sent without pre-payment, or continued longer than paid for.
Copies of the DAILY SENTINEL can be had at the office each morning, and the WEEKLY SENTINEL each Monday morning, neatly enveloped, for mailing.

WEEKLY STATE SENTINEL,
PUBLISHED EVERY MONDAY AT
One Dollar and Fifty Cts. a Year,
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Insertions	1 SQUARE	2 SQUARES	3 SQUARES	4 SQUARES	5 SQUARES	6 SQUARES	7 SQUARES	8 SQUARES	9 SQUARES
1st	0.50	1.125	1.50	1.875	2.25	2.625	3.00	3.375	3.75
2nd	1.00	1.50	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	5.00
3rd	1.25	1.875	2.50	3.125	3.75	4.375	5.00	5.625	6.25
4th	1.50	2.25	3.00	3.75	4.50	5.25	6.00	6.75	7.50
5th	1.75	2.625	3.50	4.375	5.25	6.13	7.00	7.875	8.75
1st	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	10.00
2nd	2.50	3.75	5.00	6.25	7.50	8.75	10.00	11.25	12.50
3rd	3.00	4.50	6.00	7.50	9.00	10.50	12.00	13.50	15.00
4th	3.50	5.25	7.00	8.75	10.50	12.25	14.00	15.75	17.50
5th	4.00	6.00	8.00	10.00	12.00	14.00	16.00	18.00	20.00
1st	4.50	6.75	9.00	11.25	13.50	15.75	18.00	20.25	22.50
2nd	5.00	7.50	10.00	12.50	15.00	17.50	20.00	22.50	25.00
3rd	5.50	8.25	11.00	13.75	16.25	19.00	21.50	24.00	26.50
4th	6.00	9.00	12.00	15.00	17.50	20.00	22.50	25.00	27.50
5th	6.50	9.75	13.00	16.25	19.00	21.50	24.00	26.50	29.00
1st	7.00	10.50	14.00	17.50	20.00	22.50	25.00	27.50	30.00
2nd	7.50	11.25	15.00	18.75	21.25	23.75	26.25	28.75	31.25
3rd	8.00	12.00	16.00	20.00	22.50	25.00	27.50	30.00	32.50
4th	8.50	12.75	17.00	21.25	23.75	26.25	28.75	31.25	33.75
5th	9.00	13.50	18.00	22.50	25.00	27.50	30.00	32.50	35.00
1st	9.50	14.25	19.00	23.75	26.25	28.75	31.25	33.75	36.25
2nd	10.00	15.00	20.00	25.00	27.50	30.00	32.50	35.00	37.50
3rd	10.50	15.75	21.00	26.25	28.75	31.25	33.75	36.25	38.75
4th	11.00	16.50	22.00	27.50	30.00	32.50	35.00	37.50	40.00
5th	11.50	17.25	23.00	28.75	31.25	33.75	36.25	38.75	41.25
1st	12.00	18.00	24.00	30.00	32.50	35.00	37.50	40.00	42.50
2nd	12.50	18.75	25.00	31.25	33.75	36.25	38.75	41.25	43.75
3rd	13.00	19.50	26.00	32.50	35.00	37.50	40.00	42.50	45.00
4th	13.50	20.25	27.00	33.75	36.25	38.75	41.25	43.75	46.25
5th	14.00	21.00	28.00	35.00	37.50	40.00	42.50	45.00	47.50

ADVERTISING IN THE WEEKLY.

One square	\$0.75
Two	1.00
Three	1.50
Four	2.00
Five	2.50

For each subsequent insertion for each square.....

tion of each additional square.....	30c
-------------------------------------	-----

For each subsequent insertion, and for each insertion of each additional square, 25c.

Advertisements published in both the Daily and the Weekly Sentinels, will be charged the full Daily rate, with one-half the Weekly rate added.

Business notices published in the local columns, after ten lines or under, will be charged for each insertion \$1. If over ten lines, ten cents per line.

Charges will be made for inserting the notices of the following Orders, Societies and Associations at the rates named, to be paid in advance.

Military Companies, Order of Old Fellows, Masonic Orders, Benevolent Societies and Singing Societies.

For each notice not exceeding 100 words, 25 cents for each insertion over eight lines at this rate.

Apprenticeship notices with funeral notices attached, \$1; without notice free.

Marriage notices, 50 cents.

Notices of Births, Deaths and Executions, given up by individuals or associations, or by churches, at the regular price.

Advertisements headed and placed under the head of Special Notices, if ten lines or over, will be charged double the usual rates.

Advertisements making less than three lines, inserted once in the Daily, will be charged fifty cents.

Yearly advertisements (space required).

Announcing candidates for office of every description will be charged at the rate of \$1.50 for each name in the Daily, and \$2 in the Daily and Weekly, the same to be, in all cases, paid in advance.

Legal advertisements inserted at the expense of the attorneys ordering, and not payable for the legal proceedings, but collectible at our usual time.

Accountable for the accuracy of legal advertisements beyond the amount charged for their publication.

ELDER, HARKNESS & BINGHAM,
Proprietors Indiana State Sentinel.

J. M. TILFORD,
President Indianapolis Central Jobbing Company.

REMARKS OF REV. D. STEVENSON,
ON THE RESOLUTIONS OF DR. BRECKINRIDGE ON THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY,
AND OF DR. MCMASTERS ON ABOLISHING SLAVERY UNDER MILITARY LAW, IN SYNOUD OF INDIANA, AT GREENSBURG.

INDIANAPOLIS, Nov. 20, 1862.

MR. BINGHAM.—Dear Sir:—At the recent meeting of the Synod of Indiana, two resolutions—one to approve the action of the General Assembly in adopting Dr. Breckinridge's paper on the state of the country, the other, to adopt a paper on the subject of slavery—were discussed. During the discussion of these resolutions, strong hints were expressed respecting disloyalty, and the Provost Marshal.

In justice to the Brethren who expressed these hints, I cannot think they really believed what their words implied. Reference would not thus be made to this subject, were it not that since said meeting of Synod, attempts have been made to falsify my statements. One gentleman, whose ideas of loyalty are very crude, has told me I "should have been arrested for making such a traitorous speech," and an editor of a religious paper who was not present at any time during the discussion, in a letter from Washington city to his paper, makes the following comment on my remarks: "His logic culminates in compounding the principal dogmas of one of the great political parties and of the church, and in anathematizing the other party." So far from having a desire to "compound the principal dogmas of one of the great political parties and of the church," my desire is that the church should not soil its blood-washed garments by contact with any political party. Happy the day for our country, and thrice happy the day for our beloved church, when church courts devote their energies exclusively to their appropriate work.

Will you, Mr. Editor, be so kind as to publish the accompanying remarks, so that my friends may know whether there be any justice in the charge, either of disloyalty, or of "compounding the principal dogmas of one of the great political parties and of the church, and in anathematizing the other party."

Respectfully, yours,
DAVID STEVENSON.

I fully believe true allegiance to country to be a religious duty, and I recognize the right of the General Assembly to enjoin on its ministers and churches, lawful subjection to the powers that be; but I am constrained to oppose the proposed action of this body, for the following reasons:

1st. The action of the Assembly in the passage of the "Breckinridge resolutions," was unnecessary. It was not needed in the non-seceded States. Presbyterians in these States were sufficiently loyal. No such blast from the General Assembly was needed to fan the flames of their patriotism. It was not needed by the churches in the seceded States—it could not bring back one rebel to his allegiance under the Federal Government. It weakened the hands of every loyal citizen in the South. It virtually cut off from our communion all the Southern churches. It forced them either to subject themselves to personal danger, and their property to confiscation, or to renounce allegiance to the General Assembly.

Some say they had already left us; but by a formal act of the last Assembly, the alleged secession of the Southern churches was disregarded, and the usual space left for them on the Assembly's minutes. The Breckinridge resolutions regard them as still in connection with us. It is to be

feared the continued agitation of such questions will drive from our communion many of the churches in the border slave States; and if we loose them, as we have lost the Southern churches, the time will be far distant when the church North will be far distant from the South.

Dr. Hodge, in giving his reasons why the church should not be divided, long since said that he deprecated the separation of the Old School Presbyterians in the North, among other reasons, because the North needed the South, since in the event of a separation, there is danger that the Northern church will succumb to a fanatical anti-slavery spirit, and victimize moderate conservative men. This prediction of Dr. Hodge is being rapidly fulfilled.

2d. This action of the Assembly has injured the church at the North. Conscientious opposition to it has already deprived some of our churches of the ablest preachers and best pastors in our denomination. It has given our brethren who were infected with Abolitionist heresy license to preach Abolitionism. Some of them think the most effectual plan for saving the Union, is to abolish at once, and forever, slavery in the Southern States. Hence they, regardless of all the dangers and horrors of servile insurrection, advocate, by their prayers and sermons, the immediate emancipation of the negroes. The blessed gospel of our blessed Savior inculcates the exercise of love to the human family; but some of our Northern brethren seem to forget, not only that God has any people in the South, but also that secessionists belong to the human family. I have heard at least one professed follower of Jesus, an Old School Presbyterian minister, pray in the public congregation for the "speedy hanging of all traitors." How different this from the spirit of Jesus, who, when suffering the agonies of crucifixion, offered up for his murderers the prayer, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Think you that God's children, under the public ministrations of such a preacher, can make advances in the divine life? How deplorable the state of piety in our churches! May it not truly be said of many of our ministers and people—"All seek" the negroes, "and not the things which are Jesus Christ's."

3d. The action of the Assembly has been a great injury to the country. It has sundered the last tie which bound together the North and the South. The testimony of Union men in the border slave States, and in the South, is that, so long as our church took no action on this question, they had hope of the country; but this action took away from them the last hope they cherished for the re-union of States. The separation of our churches has been regarded by the most eminent statesmen, as the greatest source of danger to our country. Permit me, in support of this opinion, to read an account given by Dr. Hill, of an interview between him and Henry Clay, Dr. Hill was then editor of "The Presbyterian Herald," of Louisville. He says:

"Concerning the greatest source of danger to the country. A few weeks prior to the death of Hon. Henry Clay, when he passed through our city on his way to Washington, at the request of a Methodist minister from one of the Northern States, who had never seen the great statesman, we called with him to see him. He was quite feeble, and spoke of his death as a probable event within a few months. He said that nothing but a deep and abiding conviction that the Union of the States was in imminent peril, could have induced him, in his state of health, to leave the quiet of his own home, and go back to the Senate, the seat of so many of his struggles and great achievements. The opinion was expressed by one or both of us, that the danger of disunion was greatly overestimated; that if it ever came to the test, it would be found that there were very few who would be mad enough to rush into disunion, either North or South. He shook his head ominously, and replied: 'Gentlemen, if I have studied anything, it is the genius and spirit of the American people, both in the North and in the South; and I tell you, there is danger. There is a spirit rising up in both sections of this republic, which, if not speedily quelled, will bring about a severance of the Union of these States, not into two, but into half a dozen little petty republics, or despotisms, as the case may be.' It was replied that on several former occasions, the North and the South had been arrayed against each other in bitter hostility, but that the hostility had died away, and the parties restored to more than their former friendly relations. 'Ah!' said he, 'that was before the rise of modern Abolitionism. Fanaticism cannot be controlled, and especially religious fanaticism. The churches of the country then stood together, and in their great national assemblies they drew the bond of Union and of brotherhood together. Now most of them have been rent asunder, and they are acting as dividers, rather than as binders of the country.' Said he, 'gentlemen, you are both ministers of the gospel, and I tell you that this sundering of the religious ties which have hitherto bound our people together, I have the greatest source of danger to the country. If our religious men cannot live together in peace, what can be expected of the politicians, very few of whom profess to be governed by the great principles of love. If all the churches divide on the subject of slavery, it will be nothing left to bind the people together but trade and commerce. That said he, 'is a very powerful bond. I admit; but when the people of these States become thoroughly alienated from each other, and get their passions aroused, they are not apt to stop to consider what is to their interest. It is against the interest of both parties in every contest, to go to war, but nations constantly do it, notwithstanding the fact. It is against the interest of men to fight duels, but they often do it, when they know that ruin, both to themselves and families, stares them full in the face. So, said

he, 'men will fight, if they consider their rights trampled upon, even if you show them that ruin to themselves and families will be the probable result. Besides, in times of high party excitement, the violent men on both sides get the control of matters, and moderate men are thrown into the background, and their counsels go unheeded.' Finding that the venerable statesman had exhausted his strength in talking, we arose to bid him adieu, as we thought, for the last time upon earth. He shook the hands of both of us, and said, 'If you preachers will only keep the churches from running into excesses and fanaticism, I think the politicians can control the masses. But, added he, 'yours is the hardest task, and if you do not perform it, we will not be able to do our part. That I consider the greatest source of danger to our country.'

Here we have the opinion of one of America's greatest statesmen and most true patriots—an opinion expressed when the icy hand of death had already taken hold of him—when his dying eye was fixed on God's judgment bar, when no motive other than the well being of his country could have influenced him—that the greatest source of danger to our country was the sundering of the religious ties which hitherto bound our people together. Where was this modern Abolitionism, of which Mr. Clay speaks, born? In New England. Where was this monster nurtured? In the bosom of the New England churches. Yes; the preachers of New England have been the nursing fathers, and the churches the nursing mothers, of Abolition fanaticism. What has it done? It has corrupted the church and destroyed the country! The professed ministers of Jesus Christ, instead of preaching the gospel, have for years been preaching Abolitionism. Instead of teaching their people the great lessons contained in the scriptures, they have poisoned their minds with infidel and anti-American doctrines. Instead of teaching them to hate sin, they have taught them to hate the constitution. It is my firm belief they have done as much as the most corrupt politicians, to plunge our country into its present calamities.

The three thousand and fifty New England clergymen, not satisfied with their occupation as preachers, must needs form themselves into a Congress-managing committee. Some of them, not satisfied with Jesus Christ as a Savior, must needs have another, whose work shall be more complete, in the person of John Brown, a felon, whom they exalt to a dignity equal, if not superior, to that of the immaculate Jesus. This spirit of Abolition fanaticism has shown itself in all our religious denominations. It divided the Baptist and Methodist and New School Presbyterian churches, North and South. It influenced the Chicago clergymen to petition Mr. Lincoln in reference to the conduct of state affairs. It influenced certain members of the General Assembly at Philadelphia to telegraph to a member of Mr. Lincoln's cabinet, asking advice respecting the political influence of certain resolutions on the state of the country, then pending in the General Assembly. And I ask you in all sincerity, if it be not the spirit which now influences the conduct of many of our ministers and churches? Is it not seen in the articles written by the editors of our religious papers? Slavery is, in their estimation, the great and only sin of our nation—the cause of all our national troubles. And is it not the great theme of discussion with most of our preachers? What reasonable hope can we have of a re-union of States, so long as our pulpits resound with political and sectional prayers and sermons? If the members of the same denomination, who hold the same faith—who serve the same master, and who profess to be influenced by the same spirit, cannot live together in peace, what can be expected from politicians, "very few of whom profess to be governed by the great principles of love?"

4. As an ecclesiastical court, we have no right to give authoritative decisions on political questions. There are questions which properly belong to civil courts, and there are questions which properly belong to church courts. There is a state government, and there is a church government; they are both of Divine appointment; but their powers are totally distinct; they do not clash, for God is a God of order, and not a God of confusion.

Even under the Jewish Theocracy, the distinction between the duties of the church and the duties of the state was distinctly drawn. Never was there a time in the history of the world, so favorable for the amalgamation of church and state, but God made express provision against this union. He made Moses, Law-giver, and he made Aaron, Priest. So far from the church and state being united under the Theocracy, the fact is, it was the confounding of their purposes and interests which brought about the destruction of the nation. Saul once undertook to discharge the duties of the priestly office, and what was the consequence? The sceptre departed from his house forever. There is no authority in the Old Testament for the amalgamation of church and state. Is there any such authority in the New Testament? "To the law and to the testimony," for if we "speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light" in us. What is the example of Christ? Did he ever interfere with state affairs? The political demagogues of His day endeavored to draw Him into political discussions. One of them asked Him if it were lawful to pay tribute to Caesar; and what was His reply? "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." But the Bible doctrine of rendering to Caesar the things which are his, does not make a Caesar, nor does it tell us who Caesar is; it merely requires that we pay him those dues which the constitution and the laws declare to be his. When Christ was upon the earth, the Holy Land was divided into several provinces. Herod and Pilate were rival Kings; one was in Galilee, the other was in Judea. The

political wire-workers of that day often tried to have our Lord interfere in their quarrels. Did he interfere? Never; nor has He given His church any authority to meddle with the political quarrels of the present day. If he has, where shall we find it? In the commission of the disciples? No! This is the commission He gave His ministering disciples: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." He did not bid His disciples "protest in the name of Almighty God" against legislative enactments, as did the three thousand and fifty New England clergymen. He did not bid them petition for edicts and intrigues at courts, as did the Chicago preachers. No! He bid them preach the gospel. He did not commission them as a "Congress-Managing Society," but as preachers of the gospel. He did not send them forth as a "Public Opinion Manufacturing Society," so that the proper party might be kept in power—no, sir. He sent them forth to proclaim the gospel of the blessed Jesus, that men might be saved from their sins. And what is the account given in scripture of their ecclesiastical meetings? Is there the least intimation that members of those bodies sent any dispatch to civil officers asking their opinions respecting the passage of loyal resolutions? Did they appoint standing committees to take counsel of Caesar? No, Sir, never! Can this be said of our modern ecclesiastical courts? It is the doctrine of the Old Testament, and of Christ and His apostles, that Christ's kingdom is a spiritual kingdom, having no alliance with secular powers; and the constitution of our church expressly declares that synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical. But the General Assembly, professing to be a court of the Lord Jesus Christ, and also professing to derive authority for all its acts from Him, and being confined by scripture to the exercise of spiritual power, and being expressly forbidden by the constitution of our church to intermeddle with civil affairs, has undertaken to decide a political question. It must be remembered that the action of the Assembly administers a rebuke to our Southern brethren for the course they have pursued in this war, and it undertakes to decide for them their duty as citizens. Many of these brethren believe they owe primary allegiance to their States, whereas the action of the Assembly assumes as a fact, that they owe primary allegiance to the National Government. We may be fully convinced our Southern brethren are in error, but this does not affect the question at issue, for the question whether a citizen owes primary allegiance to his State or to the National Government is a political question which cannot be settled by an appeal to the scriptures, by which the authoritative teachings of church courts are limited. But the General Assembly has given an authoritative decision of this question. In doing this, it has violated the constitution of the church, which expressly declares "Synods and councils are to handle and conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical, and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth."

Again—the South say they are engaged in a glorious revolution, and are contending for their sacred rights. We of the North—say they are engaged in a rebellion—fighting against the most benighted government under heaven. The brethren South are as sincere in their belief, as we are in ours. Who shall decide the controversy between us? In all our authoritative decisions as a church court, we are limited by the teachings of the scriptures. But where do the scriptures point out the distinction between a revolution and a rebellion?

The brethren South believe they are fighting for their homes, for their families, and for their inalienable rights. We of the North believe they are waging war against the best government on earth. Where has Christ Jesus given His church any authority to decide this question? When he was upon the earth, two brethren quarreled about the division of their inheritance. One of them entreated Christ's interference, and what was his reply? "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" If he were now upon the earth, and an appeal made to Him for the settlement of our present difficulties, would he assume the office of a judge respecting the rights of the North and of the South? Is it not more likely his reply would be, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." The brethren South are honest and sincere in the belief that this war, on their part, is justifiable. We of the North, with equal honesty and sincerity, contend that they are engaged in a most unjustifiable war. But where has Christ Jesus given us any authority for the decision of such questions? Will those brethren be so kind as to give us the chapter and verse? The Assembly, in this action, traveled out of the records; and if we were not deaf, we might hear the Great Head of the church saying to us in tones of reproof, "Who hath required this at your hands? In vain ye teach for doctrines the commandments of men."

I object to this action, because of its unchristian spirit. It declares it to be "the duty of the National Government to preserve, at whatever cost, the National Union and Constitution, and to crush force by force." Had this declaration come from an assemblage of gentlemen who had met together as citizens, to consult in reference to national affairs, it might be unobjectionable; but surely a church court, professing to act in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, is not called upon to decide the value of the National Union and Constitution, and is it not evidence of an unchristian spirit for such a court to declare that force should be crushed by force? Where does church courts get authority for acting as military dictators? In this war the North has already spent a thousand millions of dollars, and lost over a

quarter of a million of lives. Throughout our whole land, from the lakes to the Gulf, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans, are now heard nothing but "lamentation and weeping, and great mourning." Rachels weeping for their children, and will not be comforted, because they are not; and yet the General Assembly, speaking in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, declares it to be the duty of the National Government to continue this destruction, if necessary, until all innocent women and children at the South, and all men at the North who are able to bear arms, are slaughtered, for the Union must be preserved at whatever cost. Is there not room for harboring a doubt whether the blessed Jesus—the Prince of Peace—who told Peter to put up his sword when he had drawn it for the defense of his Divine Master, approve of this action?

I object to the paper on slavery, because we have no authority, as a court of the Lord Jesus Christ, to prescribe to citizens what they ought to urge the National Government either to do or to leave undone. This paper declares it to be the imperative duty of the citizens of the nation "to urge upon the National Government the exertion of the whole power with which it is legitimately invested, whether under military law or otherwise, to withdraw the nation from all complicity with slavery." There are several points involved in the discussion of this question:

1st. "Do the scriptures teach that the holding of slaves, without regard to circumstances, is a sin?" The General Assembly of 1845, in reply to this very question, said: "It is impossible to answer this question in the affirmative, without contradicting some of the plainest declarations of the word of God. That slavery existed in the days of Christ and His apostles, is an admitted fact. That they did not denounce the relation itself as sinful—as inconsistent with Christianity; that slaveholders were admitted to membership in the churches organized by the apostles; that whilst they were required to treat their slaves with kindness, and as rational, accountable, immortal beings, and, if Christians, as brethren in the Lord, they were not commanded to emancipate them; that slaves were required to be obedient to their masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, with singleness of heart as unto Christ, are facts which meet the eye of every reader of the New Testament. This Assembly cannot, therefore, denounce the holding of slaves as necessarily a heinous and scandalous sin, calculated to bring upon the church the curse of God, without charging the apostles of Christ with conniving at sin, introducing into the church such sinners, and thus bringing upon them the curse of the Almighty." And in reply to the question whether slaveholding should be made a bar to Christian communion, the same Assembly gave the following answer:

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States was originally organized, and has since continued the bond of union in the church, upon the conceded principle that the existence of domestic slavery under the circumstances in which it is found in the Southern portion of the country, is no bar to Christian communion."

If the holding of slaves without regard to circumstances was not a sin in 1845, how can it be a sin in 1862? And if not sinful, wherein consists the propriety of urging the National Government to withdraw the nation from all complicity with it?

The same Assembly declared that since Christ and His inspired apostles did not attempt to remove slavery from the church by legislation, we have no authority to legislate on the subject. If Christ and His inspired apostles did not attempt to remove slavery from the church by legislation, what right has this Synod to legislate on its removal, "whether by military law or otherwise," from the state?

It is contended that slavery is a moral question, and therefore it is a proper subject for church legislation. I admit that slavery has various aspects and relations, purely or mainly moral, concerning which church courts may legislate. As for example, it is competent for them to give directions to their members respecting the duty of masters and slaves. The church has jurisdiction over the moral conduct of its members in their treatment of slaves. The paper before us proposes to legislate, not on the moral aspect of this question, but upon its civil or political relations, over which church courts have no control whatever. It contains no instructions respecting the relative duties of masters and slaves, but it proposes "to urge upon the National Government the exertion of the whole power with which it is legitimately invested, whether under military law or otherwise, to withdraw the nation from all complicity with, and support of slavery. It is not a moral, but a semi-military, and semi-political deliverance."

In 1846 a letter was received by our General Assembly from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, on the subject of slavery. In reply to said letter by our General Assembly, the following passage occurs: "The relations of Negro slavery as it exists in the States that tolerate it, are two-fold. Chiefly, it is an institution purely civil, depending absolutely upon the will of the civil power in the States respectively in which it exists. Secondly, it has various aspects and relations, purely or mainly moral, in regard to which the several States permit a greater or less degree of intervention. Touching the former aspect of the subject, this General Assembly has no sort of power, any more than we should have if we met in Great Britain, over the institutions of hereditary monarchy, or aristocracy, or a thousand other things which, as republicans, we unanimously condemn, but which you, as loyal subjects, candidly approve." In the same letter, the Assembly declares: "It is the particular mission of the church to

give the blessed gospel, and not free institutions, to the human race."

"Sir, we must adjourn this Synod, and resolve ourselves into an Abolition Society, before we can pass the paper before us."

2d. Has the National Government any power to interfere with slavery in the Southern States? In the official letter of instructions from Mr. Seward, Secretary of State, to Mr. Dayton, our Minister to France, dated April 22, 1861, Mr. Seward says in reference to the rebellion:

"The condition of slavery in the several States will remain just the same, whether it succeed or fail. The rights of the States, and the condition of every human being in them, will remain subject to exactly the same laws and form of administration, whether the revolution shall succeed or whether it shall fail. Their constitutions and laws, customs, habits and institutions, in either case, will remain the same. It is hardly necessary to add to this incontestable statement the further fact that the new President, as well as the citizens through whose suffrages he came into the administration, has always repudiated all designs, whatever and wherever imputed to him and them, of disturbing the system of slavery as it is existing under the Constitution and laws. The case, however, would not be fully presented if I were to omit to say that any such effort on his part would be unconstitutional, and all his actions in that direction would be prevented by the judicial authority, even though they were assented to by Congress and the people."

Let it be remembered now that these are not Mr. Seward's words, but the President's. Mr. Seward says to Mr. Dayton, on page 197 of this document, that he writes him this letter "by direction of the President."

Here we have the declaration of the President that whether the rebellion succeeds or fails, he could not constitutionally interfere with slavery, and that even if Congress and the people should permit him so to do, he would be prevented by the judicial authority.

Congress three weeks before the inauguration of President Lincoln, adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That neither the Federal Government, nor the people or governments of non-slaveholding States, have a purpose or a constitutional right to legislate upon, or interfere with slavery in any of the States of the Union."

And the judicial authorities of the country have given similar decisions.

And now, Sir, I ask whether this Synod would not be guilty of the crime of disloyalty, if it should, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, declare that "it is the imperative duty of the citizens of the nation to do that which the executive, the legislative and judicial authority of the nation has declared to be unconstitutional?"

3. The Synod, in dictating to the citizens of the nation their duty as citizens, manifests a spirit of religious despotism. The jurisdiction of the church extends only over those who have voluntarily placed themselves within her pale. May the church dictate even to her own members their duty as citizens? Her jurisdiction extends only to their religious faith and moral conduct. She may not presume to teach them politics, or to control their votes. If her jurisdiction over her own members be thus limited, what authority has she to dictate to the citizens of the nation the policy they should urge the government to adopt in the management of national affairs? Sir, there is a principle involved in this paper subversive not only of the constitution, but also of the civil and religious liberties of citizens.

We have been told in this discussion that it is the duty of the church to declare the will of God to the state, and that the state is bound at its peril to hear and obey the church. If so, who shall decide what church the state is bound to hear and obey? The Jewish or the Christian? If Christian, shall it be the Protestant or the Roman Catholic? If Protestant, what denomination? Do our constitution and laws recognize any form of religion, or any denomination of Christians in preference to others? Suppose the National Government should hear and obey the voice of the Presbyterian church of the Synod of Indiana, as expressed in this paper, may we not proceed as Presbyterians to define to the state every part of divine revelation, and urge the citizens of the nation to demand that the National Government exert the whole power with which it is invested, "whether by military law or otherwise," for the enforcement of every religious obligation, even to the forms and ceremonies of worship?

4. The paper before us takes it for granted the National Government has a right under "military law" to abolish slavery. Does the constitution invest the President with any such authority? Says a writer in the Newburyport Herald, who voted for Mr. Lincoln:

"In subduing rebellion—of which this is the most infamous the world ever saw—we can go as far as the constitution allows, and there we must stop. We know it is becoming common in this day for persons to say, 'We will exercise certain powers, constitution or no constitution.' But that is the doctrine of revolutionists—of the Robespierres and Mirrises, who in ninety days of administration would plunge this people into all the horrors of the French revolution, when no man's life would be safe, and all property would be worthless."

"Mr. Lincoln is not of this class, he and his Cabinet and the Congress derive their powers from the constitution, and to that they must adhere or ruin comes to all. By that instrument Abraham Lincoln is President at Washington; beyond and without it he is simply A. Lincoln, of Illinois, and has no more rights or powers than has Sam Jones of Seabrook. If that constitution gives him the power to emancipate slaves within the States, and against the will of the loyal people thereof—for the loyal people are the States—then he can do it; if not, then the States or the

people have retained that right to themselves, and he has no more power to deal with the matter than we have with the species in the vases of the New York banks. Before he proceeds—unless he can see his